സാഹിബ് ബഹദൂർ കെ. എച്ച്. സുലൈമാൻ : പബ്ലിക്ക് ഫണ്ട് അനാവശ്യമായി ദുർവ്യയം ചെയ്യുന്നു എന്ന് പരാതികൾ വരുന്നതായിട്ടറിയാമോ?

ശ്രീ. സി. വി. ഇയ്യു : അങ്ങനെ വരുന്ന കാര്യങ്ങളിൽ ഗവൺമെൻറ് ഇടപെട്ടാൽ മതി. പബ്ലിക്ക് ട്രസ്റ്റ് ഫണ്ട് അഥവാ പൊതുമുതൽ എന്ന രീതിയിലുള്ള ധർമ്മസ്ഥാപനങ്ങളുടെ കാര്യത്തിൽ ഞാൻ പ്രമേയകർത്താവിനോട് യോജിക്കുന്നു എങ്കിലും ഓരോ കുടുംബത്തിന്റെ വകയായും മറ്റും ധാരാളം ധർമ്മസ്ഥാപനങ്ങളുള്ളതുകൊണ്ട് ആ വക കാര്യങ്ങളിൽ ഇടപെടാൻ പാടില്ല എന്നമാത്രമെ എനിക്ക് അഭിപ്രായമുള്ളൂ.

ശ്രീ. എ. ജെ. ജോൺ : മുസ്ലീം ധർമ്മസ്ഥാപനങ്ങളെ സംബന്ധിച്ച് സെൻട്രലിൽ ഒരാക്ടുണ്ട്. അതു് ഭേദഗതി അനുസരിച്ച് കൺകറൻറ് ലിസ്റ്റിൽ പെടുന്നതാണ്. മുസ്ലീം ധർമ്മസ്ഥാപനങ്ങൾ ധാരാളം ഉള്ളതു് ബോംബെയിലാണ്. സെൻട്രലിലെ ആക്ടിൽനിന്നും പല ഭേദഗതികളും വരുത്തി ബോംബെയിൽ ഒരു ആക്ട് പാസ്സാക്കിയിട്ടുണ്ട്. അതിനെ ആസ്പദമാക്കി ഇപ്പോൾ ഇവിടെ ഒരു ബിൽ തയാറാക്കിയിട്ടുണ്ട്. ഇതു് മുസ്ലീം സമുദായത്തിനു് തൃപ്തികരമായിരിക്കുമെന്നാണ് ഗവൺമെൻറ് വിശ്വസിക്കുന്നതു്. എന്നാൽ ബില്ല് ഫാജരാക്കുന്നതിനുമുമ്പു് ഇൻഡ്യാഗവൺമെൻറിന്റെ അനുവാദം ആവശ്യമാണ്. അതിനുവേണ്ട നടപടി ഉടൻതന്നെ നടത്തുന്നതായിരിക്കും. കഴിവുള്ളിടത്തോളം അടുത്ത നിയമസഭയിൽതന്നെ ഈ ബില്ലു് അവതരിപ്പിക്കുവാൻ ശ്രമിക്കുന്നതാണ്. അതുകൊണ്ടു് ഈ പ്രമേയം ബഹു. മെമ്പർ പിൻവലിക്കണമെന്നു് ഞാൻ അപേക്ഷിക്കുന്നു.

ശ്രീ. എ. താണുപിള്ള : സെൻട്രലിലെ ഈ ആക്ട് ഇവിടെ എക്സ്റ്റൻറ് ചെയ്തിട്ടുണ്ടോ?

ശ്രീ. എ. ജെ. ജോൺ : ഉണ്ട്.

സാഹിബ് ബഹദൂർ എ. കെ. കുഞ്ഞുമൊയിതീൻ : ഞാൻ പ്രമേയം പിൻവലിക്കുന്നു.

മിസ്റ്റർ സ്പീക്കർ : പിൻവലിക്കുന്നതിനു് സഭ അനുവദിക്കുമെന്നു് വിശ്വസിക്കുന്നു.

എതിരഭിപ്രായമില്ലാത്ത സ്ഥിതിക്കു് പിൻവലിക്കുന്നതിനു് അനുവദിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നു.

The resolution was, by leave, withdrawn.

Motion under rule 43 regarding Food Situation

Minister for Education, Food and Labour **(Sri. T. K. Narayana Pillai:)** I move that the food situation in the state be taken into consideration.

Minister for Finance and Revenue **(Sri. A. J. John)**: Sir, I second the motion.

Travancore- Cochin is the most highly deficit State in India in regard to food-grains. The entire population of the State has been brought under a system of

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

statutory rationing since 1943. The State's requirements of imported foodgrains is shown below :—

Rationing commitments for an average rationed population of 78·5 lakhs at *actual offtake*	..	5,68,000	tons
Less estimated procurement	..	80,000	,,
		4,88,000	,,
Add six weeks' buffer stock	..	65,000	,,
Total	..	5,53,000	,,

As against this, the quantities actually available to the State from imported stocks and local procurement in 1948, 1949 and 1950 were as given below:—

Year	Grain	Local procurement	Quota supplied from outside	Offtake
1948	Rice ..	64,171	3,15,294	3,55,895
	Wheat ..	Nil	50,204	45,492
1949	Rice ..	73,195	3,06,978	3,49,431
	Wheat ..	Nil	33,991	33,063
1950	Rice ..	68,818	2,47,345	3,50,000
	Wheat ..	Nil	48,128	46,000

The offtake shown above is on the basis of an overall ration, ranging from 8 oz to 10 oz. At 12 oz. per head per day, the theoretical maximum quantity required will be 9,29,000 tons as against the maximum production of about 2,75,000 tons, leaving a deficit of 6,54,000 tons. However it has never been possible for this State to maintain an over-all ration of 12 oz. and compared to the rest of India the people of this State have made disproportionately great sacrifices in the matter of consumption of foodgrains.

Recently on account of the acute scarcity of foodgrains in the whole of India as a result of natural calamities, etc., the overall ration has been reduced to 9 oz. throughout the Union. On this basis the total import requirements of this State would be obout 4,50,000 tons foodgrains. As against this we are offered for 1951 only 3,25,000 tons foodgrains, of which 2,75,000 tons will be rice and 50,000 tons wheat. This quantity is insufficient to maintain even the present low ration of 9 oz. We have made repeated representations to the Government of India about our need for larger allotments of foodgrains from outside sources. We are assured that when the food position of the country as a whole shows improvement, our request would be favourably considered.

The pool price of rice at present, is Rs. 22-11-0 per maund for coarse grains. The incidental expenses for clearing, handling, transporting and storage, come to annas 15 per maund. If the sale to the people is made at the full economic price the cost of rice would be about Rs. 47 per bag. The pool price of fine rice is Rs. 26—8—0 per maund and its issue price, if the full economic cost is charged to the consumer, would be about Rs. 55 per bag. These prices are quite

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Sri A. J. John]

beyond the means of the very large majority of people in the State. Government have realised the necessity of keeping down the price of this most essential commodity and have subsidised the sale of rice to an extent even beyond the means of the finances of the State. From 20th November 1949 the issue price from Government Depots was fixed at Rs. 16—15—3 per maund and the retail price to the consumer at Rs. 17—12—0 per maund.

The Government of India started subsidising the sale of imported foodgrains in the Provinces from 1st April 1946. The scheme of food subsidy by the Centre was extended to this State only from 1st October 1948 when Sri. Thanu Pillai was the Chief Minister. Fromt he above date till 31st March 1950 the Government of India was meeting 50 per cent of the loss incurred by the State from the subsidised sale of imported rice. The total subsidy paid to the State by the Centre up to 31st March 1950 was Rs. 2·5 crores. The sudsidy granted to other States and provinces up to the above period was, as given below.—

		(In crores of rupees)
Bombay	..	32·4
Madras	..	15·4
Uttar Pradesh	..	8·7
West Bengal	..	8·5
Delhi	..	6·2
Madhya Predesh	..	2·6
East Panjab	..	1·8
Mysore	..	1·0
Others	..	5.4
Total	..	82·00

With the coming into effect of the scheme of federal financial integration from 1st April 1950 the food subsidy granted to this State was increased from 50 per cent to 75 per cent of the loss on the sale of imported rice. On this basis the share of the loss to be borne by the Government of India on the subsidised sale of 275,000 tons of the rice offered to us in 1951 would be Rs. 3·75 crores as shown below.—

Revised pool price	..	Rs. 22—11—0 per maund
Incidentals	..	Rs. 0—15—0
Total	..	Rs. 23—10—0
Weighted average issue price	..	Rs. 16—15—3
Total loss	..	Rs. 6—10—9
Loss on 1 ton of rice		Rs. 182—0—0

loss of 2·75 lakhs tons of rice Rs. 500,50,000 or say Rs. 5 crores.

Share of the Government of India at 75 per-cent of the loss Rs. 3·75 crores

The above calculation is made on the assumption that the entire quantity of rice supplied to the state will be of the coarse variety of which the present pool price is Rs. 22—11—0 per maund. However contrary to our expectations the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Government of India are now supplying us fairly large quantities of fine rice charged at Rs. 26—8—0 per maund. Up to 10th March 1951 we have received 7,63,634 maunds of fine rice. The Difference between the cost price and selling price of this variety of rice is Rs. 10—7—9 per maund *i.e.*, nearly Rs. 21 per bag. Our total loss on this variety alone during the current year up to 10th March 1951 is about Rs.80 lakhs. On the coarse and broken varieties during the above period there is a loss of another Rs. 80 lakhs, making an aggregate loss of Rs. 160 lakhs during 79 days *i.e.*, nearly Rs. 2 lakhs a day. On this basis the total loss to this State from the subsidised sale of foodgrains at the current prices would be about Rs. 7 crores *i. e.*, about 50 per cent of our annual revenues.

In regard to fine rice, the present policy of the Government of India is that its sale will not be subsidised by them. The state Governments should either sell it at the full cost price or subsidise the sale from their own finances. If this principle is to be put into practice the first condition is that the State Governments should know as soon as a consignment is released to them, how much of it is fine rice and how much of other varieties. Our experience so far is that there is an interaval of nearly four to six weeks between the release of the consignment to us and the receipt of information regarding the classification of the stock. Thus during the period 1st January 1951 to 10th March 1951, 16 steamers discharged rice for this State. Almost the entire allotment received from these steamers was classified as coarse and broken at the time the consignment was delivered to us. The Government of India claimed the price of the stock on the basis of this classification and we arranged payments also accordingly. After an interval of of sevral weeks we were informed that nearly 1/3 of the stock already released to us long ago as coarse grains, was really fine rice and should be paid for at the enhanced rate of Rs. 26—8—0 per maund. Up to the end of February, the intimation received by us from the Government of India showed that only 355,441 maunds of fine rice was released to us. But now we are informed that the quantity of fiine rice actually included in these consignments is 763,634 maunds. Whole ship loads of Burma rice originally classified as coarse rice has now been re classified as fine rice. It is a fact very well known to the Government of India that in regard to foodgrains this State is having a sort of 'ship to mouth' existence. We have so little buffer stock that within a few days of the arrival of a steamer, the whole cargo is issued as ration to the consumers. How then is it possible for this Government to charge the full pool price on fine rice when intimation regarding the classification is received only several weeks after the issue of the consignment to the consumers? The loss sustained by this Government on fine rice alone for the period up to 10th March 1951 is about Rs. 80 lakhs. This loss cannot be recovered from the consumer now. The result is that the present food policy of the Government of India is shattering the economy of this State and ruining its finances.

Revised food subsidy scheme of the Government of India

The Government of India have decided to revise, with effect from 1st January 1951 their policy of food subsidy and to limit their commitments to subsidising the sale only in a few urban and industrial centres in each State. Thus in Madras State, the Government of India will subsidise the sale of rice only in the cities of Madras, Coimbatore, Madura and Vizagapatanam and in Mysore, only in the cities of Mysore and Bangalore. In this State, according to the Government of India, there are no important urban or industrial centres of the selected type. However it is recognised that, owing to the large extent of the food deficit in the State, the subsidising of the entire consumption in the State will be beyond the financial capacity of the State. The Government of India have therefore offered

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Sri A. J. John]

us a lump sum subsidy of Rs. 1·5 crores in 1951 and have suggested that we may increase the issue price of rice to Rs. 20 per maund.

Issue price

The present issue price of rice to the consumer in the State, viz., Rs. 17—12—0 per maund is, perhaps, the highest in the Union. The maximum retail prices fixed by the Government of India in the various industrial and urban centres coming under the revised food subsidy scheme are as shown below.—

		Rs.	A.	P.	
Bombay	..	15	10	0	per maund
Madras	..	15	10	7	per maund
Mysore	..	14	15	6	per maund
Hyderabad	..	15	10	0	per maund

It is the declared policy of the Government of India that both in regard to consumption of foodgrains and prices there should be equality of sacrifice between the various States. It is therefore surprising that our people should be asked to pay Rs. 20 per maund for their rice while the consumers in Bombay, Madras, Mysore and Hyderabad are asked to pay only about Rs. 15 per maund.

The very basis of the revised scheme of food subsidy seems to be wrong. In Bombay State for example the centres selected by the Government of India for the subsidised sale of foodgrains are Bombay City, Ahamedabad, Poona and Sholapur. The subsidised rate at which the foodgrains will be supplied are, wheat at Rs. 14 per maund as against the pool price of Rs. 16—6—0 per maund and rice at Rs. 15—12—0 per maund as against the pool price of Rs. 22—11—0 per maund. The major portion of the population in these cities are the labourers in the textile mills. These mills are now making such huge profits that it should be easily possible for them to subsidise the sale of foodgrains to their labourers. But instead of asking the mill owners to bear this burden which it is quite possible for them to do, the Government of India have assumed upon themselves a great liability, to the serious detriment of the people living in other parts of the country who are not able to pay the economic price of the grains supplied to them. In this State several lakhs of people are engaged in the production of tea. cardamom, pepper and other cash crops from the sale of which in the overseas markets the Government of India are earning a large portion of their dollar and sterling exchange. It is estimated that we are contributing about Rs. 30 to 40 crores worth of dollar and sterling to the common pool. This is more than twice the amount required for the purchase of all our requirements of imported grains. What is the justification for refusing to subsidise the rice issued to the workers who help to earn the dollar and sterling exchange with which the foodgrains are purchased and subsiding the sale of rice to the mill worker in Bombay and Ahemedabad whose conditions of service are much better? This distinction is most unfair and is not based on any sound principles.

The suggestion now made by the Government of India is that the issue price of rice in the State which is already higher than in any other State should be still further raised up to Rs. 20 per maund. If this suggestion is accepted the price of rice would be beyond the means of a very large section of the people of the State and there will be widespread hardship and suffering. It is therefore not possible to increase the present issue price to any appreciable extent.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

In regard to the other States in the Union it will be possible for them to make good the loss resulting from the application of the revised food subsidy scheme by effecting a small increase in the over all issue price of foodgrains, both locally procured and imported. This is because in their case the imported grain forms only a small percentage of the local production. The figures for some of the neighbouring states are as given below:

	Local production (in thousands of tons)	*Imports (in thousands of tons)*	*Per cent*
Madras	6,100	400	6
Mysore	717	75	11
Hyderabad	1,319	75	6

In this State the deficit is more than 50%. We will therefore have to increase our price by a substantial margin if we are to make up the loss from the subsidised sale of foodgrains.

If the offer of the lump sum subsidy of Rs. 1·5 crores is accepted this State will have to meet from its own finances a loss of Rs. 3·5 crores if only coarse grain is supplied and about Rs. 5·5 crores if fine rice is supplied. The State Budget for this year contains a provision of Rs. 125 lakhs for food subsidy. This is about 10% of our total revenues. In Mysore, where the revenue is almost equal to this State, the amount set apart for food subsidy is only Rs. 16 lakhs. The large amount already set apart by us for this item has very seriously curtailed our available resources for nation-building and development schemes. If this amount has to be increased to Rs. 3·50 or Rs. 5·5 crores there will be very little left for financing nation-building activities and the consequences to the people will be disastrous.

When we entered the scheme of financial integration with the Centre we were made to understand that from the date of federal financial integration the State would be eligible to get food subsidy at the rate of 75% of our loss. This was a very important inducement which weighed with us in accepting the scheme. But for such a substantial assistance, it would have been impossible for the State to establish financial equilibrium. The agreement of federal financial integration states that the subsidy of 75% of the loss payable to the State will be "as in the case of the Provinces." The Government of India are now taking the view that as the Provinces are not being granted 75% of the loss as subsidy, the State also is not entitled to claim it. This is putting too legal and technical an interpretation on the provisions in the Agreement and is against the spirit of the Article and the understanding which the parties had at the the time of entering into the agreement. Our claim is that in equity, if not in the strict letter of the law, we are entitled to get 75% of our loss as subsidy and that without such assistance the finances of the State would be ruined.

The change in the scheme of food subsidy has affected this State far worse than other Part B States. Thus in the case of Mysore the total quantity of foodgrains to be imported to the State from outside in 1951 is only 75,000 tons. Out of this 40,000 tons is wheat and 20,000 milo. These grains were not subsidised by the Government of India before. Therefore the only quantity of grain for which Mysore would have received subsidy under the old system is rice to the extent of 15,000 tons. The issue price of rice in Mysore before 1st January 1951 was Rs. 14—10—0 per maund. The difference between the present pool price and the above selling price is about Rs. 8 per maund. On this basis the total loss from the subsidised sale of 15,000 tons rice would be about Rs. 33 lankhs. At 75% of the loss the share of the Government of India would be Rs. 24·75 lakhs and that of

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Sri. A. J. John]

Mysore Rs. 8·25 lakhs. Under the revised scheme Mysore is getting 40,000 tons of wheat at the rate of Rs. 13—14—0 per maund, 20,000 tons milo at Rs. 8—2—0 per maund. and 10,000 tons rice at Rs. 15—15—0 per manud. The total extent of the subsidy from the Government of India on these items will be about Rs. 70 lakhs. Thus Mysore has definitely benefited by the change in the scheme of food subsidy by the Centre. She will get about Rs. 70 lakhs as subsidy under the present system as against a subsidyof about Rs. 24·75 lakhs only at 75% of the loss on the sale of rice. The same proposition holds good in the case of Hyderabad and all the other Part B States. In regard to Travancore-Cochin alone the revised system of food subsidy has resulted in a reduction of the subsidy from Rs. 3·75 crores to Rs. 1·5 crores. This is a position which we are unable to accept. The condition of this State is peculiar and has no comparison with that of other States, whether Part A or Part B. A lump sum subsidy of even Rs. 3·5 crores will not be sufficient to bring our losses within the financial capacity of the Government. The Centre is aware of our real position and if they refuse to meet our demand for 75 per cent of our total loss on food transactions, the only inference I can draw is that they are unmindful of the disastrous consequences of their present food policy on the finances of the Government and the economy of the State.

There is another outstanding question regarding food subsidy by the Centre. In 1950 we were informed by the Government of India that in conformity with their policy of limiting the import of foodgrains, the major portion of the quota allotted to this State will be made available from the surplus States within India. It was understood that the price of the locally procured grain will be much less than that of the imported grain and that the State Government will not incur any loss from its sale to the consumers. On the basis of this expectation we made a provision of only Rs. 25 lakhs in our budget for 1950-51 for food subsidy, in order to provide for any unforeseen contingency. However contrary to our expectations, the price of the locally procured rice supplied to us from U. P. and Madhya Bharat was higher than that of the imported rice. We received 30,000 tons of rice from U. P. The average price of U. P. rice was Rs. 24—15—0 per maund as against Rs. 22—0—0 per maund for imported rice. The loss to the State from the subsidised sale of the U. P. rice alone was Rs. 65 lakhs. The Government of India have declined to pay any subsidy on this loss on the ground that their scheme of food subsidy extends only to imported rice. This is taking a too technical view of a very vital question. The reason given by the Government of India for subsidising the sale of imported rice is that it is more high-priced than the locally procured rice and unless its sale is subsidised it will upset the local economy. The real question is therefore only the price of the rice and not the source from which it is obtained. To grant subsidy for imported rice and to refuse it for locally procured rice which is even more costly than the imported rice, is to forget the real object and make a distinction which is opposed to all canons of fairness and equity. We have pointed out these aspects of the question to the Government of India and have told them that it is impossible for this Government to bear the whole loss from the sale of the abnormally high priced U. P. rice and that 75 per cent of our loss should be borne by them. The matter is still under consideration.

The point I wish to make clear is that this State which is highly deficit in foodgrains but abundantly rich in valuable cash crops which are in great demand in the foreign markets, cannot be treated in the same manner as other States which are more or less self-sufficient in food-grains but contribute very little to the foreign earnings of the Union. Nearly one-fifth of the total dollar and sterling exchange earned by the Union is from the sale of our cash crops and commercial products.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

A large portion of this foreign exchange is used for the purchase of food-grains for the whole of India. The Government of India are also deriving a large revenue, amounting to several crores of rupees, by taxing the export of our monopoly commercial crops. The export duty on pepper alone for the coming year is estimated at Rs. 4 crores. It is only fair that a State which is contributing so much to the Union exchequer and to its foreign resources is treated in a fair manner in regard to the supply of rice in which it is highly deficit. Otherwise there is a real danger that a large area in this State which is now under cash crops may be converted into food crops. Such a change which may be forced upon our people on account of the extreme scarcity of food-grains and their high cost will do good neither to the Union nor to this State. I hope that this warning will be heeded by the Government of India in time and that we will not be driven to desperate remedies which may cure our present ills but cause irreparable harm to the country at large.

Just now a communication has been received from the Government of India Ministry of Food and Agriculture, which reads of follows.—

"I am directed to invite a referrence to your letter No. F.d. 3-10051/50/Fd. D., dated the 20th January 1951, and the Memo, enclosed therewith on the subject mentioned above and to state that the Government of India have carefully considered your request and regret their inability to agree to the continuance of the subsidisation of the loss on the sale of the imported foodgrains on the same basis as was in force upto 31—12—1950.

"In view however, of the circumstances mentioned in your letter under reply the Government of India has as a special case decided to increase the lumpsum subsidy payable to the State of Travancore-Cochin from Rs. 1·5 crores as communicated in this Ministry letter of even No. dated the 29th December 1950 to Rs. 2·25 crores for the period 1—1—1950 to 31—12—1951 subject to the condition that the State Government does not raise the retail issue price of rice beyond Rs. 19 (Rs. Nineteen) per maund. I am also to make it very clear that this decision to pay a lump sum subsidy of Rs. 2·25 crores during 1951, is purely an ad-hoc arrangement and will not be continued in the year 1952. It is requested that the State Government may please keep this in view and formulate their budget for 1952 making no provision for the payment of any subsidy from the Government of India.

"It has also been decided that the lump sum subsidy of Rs. 2·25 crores referred to above will be paid to the State of Travancore-Cochin in twelve monthly instalments of Rs. 18,75,000 each. I am therefore to request you to send duly receipted bills accordingly together with a certificate to the effect ..... etc."

With these words I second the motion.

ശ്രീ. എ. കെ. പാപ്പുപിള്ള: ദീർഘമായ ഈ സ്റ്റേറ്റുമെൻറിൻെറ ഒരു ചുരുക്കം കിട്ടുകയാണെങ്കിൽ അതുനോക്കി മനസ്സിലാക്കാൻ എളുപ്പമുണ്ട്. മനസ്സിൽനിൽക്കാത്ത അധികം കണക്കുകളാണ് ഇപ്പോൾ ഇവിടെ വായിച്ചത്. അതുകൊണ്ട് ഇതിൻെറ ഒരു ചുരുക്കം മെമ്പറന്മാർക്കു തരുവാൻ എളുപ്പാടുചെയ്യുകയാൽ നന്നായിരിക്കുമെന്ന് എനിക്കു അഭിപ്രായമുണ്ട്.

ശ്രീ. എ. ജെ. ജോൺ: പ്രധാനപ്പെട്ട സംഗതികൾ ബഹു. മെമ്പറുടെ അറിവിനായി ഞാൻ ചുരുക്കത്തിൽ പറയാം. നമുക്ക് അടുത്ത പ്രാവശ്യം തരാമെന്നു സമ്മതിച്ചിരിക്കുന്ന ഭക്ഷ്യധാന്യങ്ങളുടെ അളവു ൩,൫. ൪, ൦ ൦ ൦ ടണ്ണാണ്. ഇതിൽ ഏകദേശം നമുക്ക് കിട്ടാനിടയുള്ളതു ൫,൭ ൫,൦ ൦ ൦ ടൺ അരിയും ൫ ൦,൦ ൦ ൦ ടൺ ഗോതമ്പുമായിരിക്കും. ൧൯൫൦ ഡിസംബർ

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Sri. A. J. John]

നമ്മുടെ നാട്ടിൽ പുറത്തുനിന്നും വരുത്തുന്ന അരിയുടെ നഷ്ടത്തിൽ ഒരു ശതമാനം ഇൻഡ്യാ ഗവണ്മെൻറ വഹിച്ചുകൊണ്ടിരുന്നു. ബാക്കി ഒരു ശതമാനംമാത്രം നാം വഹിച്ചാൽ മതിയായിരുന്നു. അരിക്കുമാത്രമേ സബ്സിഡി അനുവദിച്ചിട്ടുള്ളൂ. ഗോതമ്പു്, മൈലോ മുതലായ ധാന്യങ്ങൾക്കു് സബ്സിഡി അനുവദിച്ചിട്ടില്ല. ഈ ജാനുവരി മുതൽക്കുശേഷം അരിയുടെവില മാണ്ടിനു് ഒരു രൂപയായിരുന്നതു ഒരു രൂ. മുതൽ രൂ. മുക്കിയിട്ടുണ്ടു്. അങ്ങിനെ മുതൽ വിലകൂടുതൽ വാങ്ങുന്നവിലയിൽ ഉണ്ടായിട്ടുണ്ടു്. ഇതു രണ്ടാംതരം അരിയുടെ വിലയാണു്. രണ്ടാംതരം അരിമാത്രമാണു് നമുക്കു് കിട്ടുന്നതെങ്കിൽ ആകെ ഒരു കോടിരൂപ നഷ്ടംവരും. അതിൽ ഒന്നരകോടിരൂപ ഇൻഡ്യാഗവണ്മെൻറ താമെന്നു പറഞ്ഞിരുന്നു. ബാക്കി മൂന്നരകോടിയും നാം സഹിക്കണം. എന്നാൽ ഇപ്പോൾ തരുന്ന കുറെഅരി ഒന്നാംതരം തന്നെന്നാണു് പറയുന്നതു്.

ശ്രീ. കളത്തിൽ വേലായുധൻ നായർ: ഒന്നാംതരം എന്നു പറയുന്നതു പേരിൽമാത്രമേ ഉള്ളോ, അതോ അരിയും മെച്ചമാണോ?

ശ്രീ. എ. ജെ. ജോൺ: രണ്ടുമായിട്ടു വലിയ വ്യത്യാസം ഒന്നുമില്ല. കുറെ അരി അയച്ചുതന്നു, അതു രണ്ടാംതരമാണെന്നാണു് വിചാരിച്ചിരുന്നതു്. പക്ഷേ ഇപ്പോൾ അവർ എഴുതിഅയച്ചിരിക്കുന്നു അതു ഒന്നാംതരം അരിയാണെന്നു്.

ശ്രീ. എ. കെ. പാച്ചുപിള്ള: നമുക്കു് ഇന്ന അരിമതി എന്നു പറയാനുള്ള സ്വാതന്ത്ര്യമില്ലേ?

ശ്രീ. എ. ജെ. ജോൺ: അരി വേണമെങ്കിൽ തരുന്നതു എടുത്തുകൊള്ളണം. രണ്ടാംതരമാണെന്നു വിചാരിച്ചു് കുറെ അരിയെടുത്തു. പക്ഷെനാലാഴ്ചകഴിഞ്ഞപ്പോൾ എഴുതിവന്നിരിക്കുന്നു അതു് ഒന്നാംതരം അരിയാണു്, നാം ഒന്നാംതരം അരിയുടെ വിലകൊടുക്കണം എന്നു്. രണ്ടാംതരം അരിയേക്കാൾ ഒന്നാംതരം അരിക്കു് മാണ്ടിനു് ൮ രൂപ. വിലകൂടുതലാണു്. ജാനുവരി ഒന്നാംതിയതിക്കുശേഷം ൭൭ ദിവസത്തേക്കു അരി വാങ്ങിവിറ്റവകയിൽതന്നെ മുന്നു ലക്ഷം രൂപ ഗവണ്മെൻറിനു് നഷ്ടംവന്നിട്ടുണ്ടു്. അതായതു രണ്ടുലക്ഷത്തിൽ ചിലപ്പോൾ രൂപയാണു് ഒരു ദിവസത്തെ നഷ്ടം. ഈ കണക്കുവച്ചുനോക്കിയാൽ ഒരു കൊല്ലത്തെ നഷ്ടം ഏഴുകോടി രൂപയായിരിക്കും. നമ്മുടെ സംസ്ഥാനത്തിന്റെ ഒരുകൊല്ലത്തെ ആകെ വരുമാനം മുതൽ കോടി രൂപയാണു്. അതിൽ നിന്നും ൭ കോടിരൂപ അരിക്കച്ചവടത്തിനുമാത്രം നീക്കിവയ്ക്കേണ്ടിവരും. അതിനെ സംബന്ധിച്ചു് ഒന്നരമാസത്തിനുമുമ്പു നടന്ന ചീഫ് മിനിസ്റ്റരന്മാരുടെ കാൺഫറൻസിൽവച്ചു് ഈ ഗവണ്മെൻറ ഒരു മെമ്മോറാണ്ടം കൊടുക്കുകയും ൭൫ ശതമാനം നഷ്ടം തന്നില്ലെങ്കിൽ ഈ ഗവണ്മെൻറിനെക്കൊണ്ടു് ഭരണംനടത്താൻ സാധിക്കാതെവരുന്നതാണെന്ന ശക്തിയായ വാദം പുറപ്പെടുവിക്കയും ചെയ്തിട്ടുണ്ടു്. ഇപ്പോൾ ൭൫ ലക്ഷം രൂപകൂടി കൂടുതൽ തരാമെന്നു പറഞ്ഞിട്ടുണ്ടു്. അതേസമയം വില മാണ്ടിനു മുതൽ രൂപയിൽ കൂട്ടാൻ പാടില്ലെന്നു പ്രത്യേകം പറഞ്ഞിട്ടുമുണ്ടു്. ആദ്യമേ അനുവദിച്ച ഒന്നരകോടിരൂപ മാസം പന്ത്രണ്ടര ലക്ഷം വീതം വാങ്ങിക്കൊള്ളാൻ അനുവദിച്ചിരുന്നു. പക്ഷെ ആ തുക വാങ്ങിയതുകൊണ്ടു് എന്തെങ്കിലും കുഴപ്പമുണ്ടായി എന്നുവേണ്ടെന്നുകരുതി ആതുക ഇതുവരെ വാങ്ങിയിട്ടില്ല. ഇങ്ങനെ തുടർന്നുപോയാൽ ഈ ഗവണ്മെൻറിനു മുമ്പോട്ടുപോകാൻ സാദ്ധ്യമല്ലാതെവരും. ബഹു. മെമ്പറന്മാർ ഈസംഗതി വളരെ ഗാഢമായി ആലോചിക്കേണ്ടതാണു്.

Sri. P. Balakrishnan Tampi: I am indeed thankful to the Hon'ble Mr. John for expressing our opinion in the mater in unmistakable words, to the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Government of India. I find that all we have expressed on the floor of this House had been incorported in his speech which he just now read to us. I wish—I do not for a moment doubt it yet—I must say I wish he had represented to the Government of India the situation as it is in the State. I need not hide from this House the view, without reviving old controversies and animosities, that there is a considerable section in the country which believes that we had been going to very extreme steps in the matter of signing all along the dotted line in our agreement for the Union. That is the view in the country. It is not on a fault finding mood that I say so. When we gave away our customs, our income-tax, etc., to the Centre, did we expect this sort of treatment from the Central Government ? Is it for the luxury of belonging to a Union of India and submitting to the doctrinaire principles in the first part of the Constitution that we joined the Indian Union ? Are we third rate or fourth rate people—I mean no disparagement to the people at large—like Himachal Predesh Vindhya Pradesh, etc. The most advanced people in the whole of India jointly worked and made great sacrifices, but we are not hero worshippers here in this land. We are people who judge things on their merits. What is the result? True that we celebrated the Independence Day. True that we have presented addresses of welcome to prominent personalities in India. But what is the result of it ? We pay more for food than do any other people in India. Is it just that any man in India, should pay more for his food than another? Then, what do these directive principles mean to the State ? Is it anything wonderful that Dr. Ambedkar did—collecting these first principles from the different constitutions of the world, and then the Minister concerned—I think it was the Central Food Minister who told us, "Do not repeat it next time". Is it doles out of charity that they are giving us ? Is it some contribution to the Red Cross Fund ? When we are making all our resources available to them, when he have given our revenue earning sources department after department, to them, we claim it as a right, not as doles out of a charity fund. Now that the honourable Food Minister has taken us into his confidence—I do not wish to speak very much by way of protesting against the tone of the letter from the Government of India—and told the Government of India all that we had in mind, if the Government of India are just, what they shou'd do is that this burden should be so shared equally by all the people of India—by all the States of the land. What is the price that the U.P people get ? Is it because UP produced a man like the Prime Minister of India or a distinguished fighter for freedom—Pantji ? Or is it because some other people were born in U.P that we are to pay much higher prices for their rice ? Are we so devoid of logic as to feel that there is equity in the arrangement by which we pay more price for Indian rice than for imported rice ? Then we are being told that the arrangements are only for imported rice. Now, is it more luxurious to eat U. P. rice at an enhanced price than good Burma rice at a lower price ? The whole thing comes to this. They believe that we are far away from New Dehli. May be our pressure on them is not so heavy as that of of other States. In this connection, I remember in India, years ago, we resented the term 'Native State,' although the term 'Native' did not mean anything objectionable. But it had certain associations, which were harmful to the national sentiment. In the same manner, Sir, I have come to the feeling that the inclusion of our State in the category of what is known as "B" class States is a suggestion that we are in a secondary stage of development. Therefore, I appeal to the Honourable Food Minister just to make them understand that it is an act of patronage on our part, an act of sacrifice on our part that we have come into the picture and joined the Indian Union. Not because, we felt that we are going to be civilized, that our standards are going to be raised. Incidentally, I may say in the matter of telephone development, we have been the foremost State in India. Now, for getting a telephone connection, you will have to write to some people in New Delhi. Anger and food discussion do not go together. Therefore, if I cannot restrain my anger,

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

I would have at a tangent gone to the integration of the services done by them and had my say on the matter. But that is not the point before us.

Sri. A. J. John: I may read that portion of the Krishnamachari's Report- an agreement entered into between the Travancore-Cochin State and the Government of India.

Sri. P. Balakrishnan Tampi: Who is this Krishnamachari—as if he is a very big person? (Laughter).

Sri. A. J. John: It is an agreement.

Sri. P. Balakrishnan Tampi: I do not accept it. That is done by a Madrasi.

Sri. A. J. John:

"The representatives of the Travancore-Cochin Government emphasized that where the immediate abolition of those customs duties have become imperative in connection with the proposed formation of the Union of the two States, it would be altogether impossible for the Union to bear the results of the loss of revenue except under a financial help from the Central Government. It may be mentioned here that the chief consideration requiring the immediate abolition of those duties on the constitution of the Travancore-Cochin Union instead of their gradual lifting as permitted by the Constitution is that such duties exist at present only in the Travancore State and Cutch. It would be difficult to justify extension so as to embrace Cochin State also. The obvious course is to abolish them. If some means could be found to mitigate the financial shock involved by such a measure, we pointed out that if the Travancore-Cochin Union would agree to our scheme of federal financial integration which would become effective simultaneously with the constitution of the Union itself or at some other conveniently early date, that is to say, from the commencement of their financial year, 17th August 1949, corresponding to the 1st Chingom 1125, the contribution of the Government of India towards food subsidies would automatically go up from 50 per cent to 75 per cent of the totel loss on the sale of imported foodgrains, the latter being the percentage applicable to Provinces. Such an increase in the amount of food subsidies would mean in effect that the Travancore-Cochin Union would be provided with additional resources on a gradually diminishing scale for a period of years so that they may develop alternative sources of revenue over the same period to cover the loss on account of the abolition of the land customs."

This is incorporated in the agreement entered into between the Rajpramukh and the Covernment of India.

Sri. P. Balakrishnan Tampi: Then my point is that that agreement has not been statisfactory and that even that agreement has not been followed. Before the integration, it was all talk in the Mazzinian fashion, of the future of Bharatavarsha. After the integration, they have started talking like a hairsplitting lawyer, of giving 25 per cent. subsidy, etc.

The second point is that the Central Covernment is making an awful mistake in regard to the purchase of food grains. To us in the South, in Madras and in Travancore-Cochin, rice is the most important article of food. What is the kind of rice that we get here? We are not getting as much quantity that we want and even what we get is not of good quality.

Mr. Speakr: We will now adjourn.

The House adjourned at 4-32 p.m. to meet again at 11 a.m. on the 4th April, 1951.

V. KRISHNAMOORTHI AIYAR,
Secretary to the Legislative Assembly.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly